

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 28, 2005. Claims 15 to 26 are in the application, of which Claims 15 and 22 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Turning first to a formal matter involving the Information Disclosure Statement dated October 29, 2002, Applicant has received an initialled copy of the form PTO-1449 attached thereto. However, the initialled copy did not include initialling by the entry corresponding to GB 2,264,022. Moreover, there has not been any indication that the Information Disclosure Statement might have been defective, or might have warranted a refusal to consider the cited document. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a copy of form PTO-1449, which indicates that GB 2,264,022 has been considered and made formally of record. This is a third request.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, a new title has been selected, as requested.

Claims 15 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. According to the Office Action, these claims have somehow been interpreted so that the specify that image data coded by two coding units is the same as image data already in a memory unit. The rejection is therefore respectfully traversed. The interpretation posited in the Office Action is not consistent with the plain language of the claims. Nevertheless, to avoid the possibility of misinterpretation, Claims 15 and 22 have been amended so as to specify that the image processing apparatus has an image memory unit for storing image data, and that first and second coding units respectively encode the image data stored in the

image memory. In particular, the first coding unit executes coding of a first portion of the image data stored in the image memory, and the second coding unit executes coding of a second portion of the image data stored in the image memory. Such functionality is clearly disclosed throughout the originally-filed specification, with one example being found at page 18, lines 4 through 14.

As for Claims 27 and 28, these claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of this rejection, which should therefore be viewed as a traversal for the reasons specified above.

Claims 22 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. According to the Office Action, Claim 22 does not specify "where the image data comes from". The rejection is therefore respectfully traversed, since it appears to pertain to breadth and not to indefiniteness. See MPEP § 2173.04. There is no requirement to specify where the image data "comes from; nevertheless, in an effort to advance this case to allowance, Claim 22 has been amended so as to specify that the claimed image memory unit is adapted to store image data, and that the first and second coding units code respective portions of the image data. Withdrawal of this basis for rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 was further rejected under § 112 on the theory that the claimed "image memory unit" does not specify any functionality. The rejection is respectfully traversed since an image memory unit is a well-understood device for which a recitation of functionality is not deemed necessary for purposes of definiteness. Nevertheless, as indicated above, Claim 22 has been amended so as to specify that the image memory unit is

"adapted to store image data", and withdrawal of this basis for rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 27 was also apparently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on the stated basis that there is apparently an inconsistency in the claimed switching unit which connects "either" to the first or second coding unit. The rejection is respectfully traversed, since the word "either" does not appear in the claim. Nevertheless, Claims 27 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of this rejection, which should therefore be viewed as a traversal for the reasons stated above.

Finally, Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged incompleteness. According to the rejection, the claim omitted essential steps since, in the view of the Office Action, the steps of access control and execution are independent and not related to each other. The rejection is respectfully traversed, since the execution step very clearly refers to coding performed by the first and second coding units found in the access step. Nevertheless, in an effort to advance this case to allowance, Claim 22 has been amended so as to specify that the first portion of the image data is transferred from the image memory unit by using the first data transfer channel, and that the second portion of the image data is transferred from the image memory unit by using the second data transfer channel. Accordingly, withdrawal of this basis for rejection is respectfully requested.

There are no other matters raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, the application is seen to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicant
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 102565v1